

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Ronald Reagan Gubernatorial Campaign: Files,
1966

Folder Title: RR Speeches and Statements Book I
(3 of 5)

Box: C30

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Occidental College
Political Science Forum

8 March 66

Q/A

Has everything grown so complex, or have people jut grown more complicated? Perhaps it's we're in a position today as we worry about our great problems, like the author who comes to a point in his story where he has a knotty plot problem and he's stuck for a way to get around it, and finally it dawns on him that he's based the entire story on a false premise. First let's try to cut throught the semantics a little bit.

Every one today in America comes complete with hyphen. If you're a clergy man why you're of a social gospel hyphen clergy, or you're the fundamentalist hyphen clergy, or you're the economist- traditional, and all of us of course must be properly pigeon holed as conservative, liberal or moderate or ultra-left or ultra-right, or some degree in between. Now I think those labels demand some discussion.

The chairman of the Democratic party here in Southern California, though I must say, he confused me a little bit. He was asked a question, how will your party deal with the extremist groups. And he said that at this moment "I know of no single group in the Democratic party that poses any particular kind of problem from the point of view of extremism that I'm quite certain that the right wing influence of the Republican party will be a major to most Democratic candidates for office in 1966. But where he began to lose me was when he then said the strength of the Democratic party is its diversity, and the Republicans will not become strong until they learn to accomodate diversity."

I can just only repeat, we're trying.

But basically today's conservative is actually the radical of revolutionary day. Those who advocate the liberal philosophy could best be described as if they'd lived in that day, the Tories. Before you take exception to that, let me point out that the revolutionists were conservative in the Edmund-Burke concept of Conservatism. The recent philosophy directed toward the control of forces of change in such a way as to conserve the best elements of the past by blending them with the new elements in an ever revolving society. But those revolutionists were just that. They were revolutionists and they were radical in their determination to order the age old status-quo - that's Latin for the mess we're in. But they were devoted to the idea that rule should belong closer to the hand of the people and should be taken from anyone, any single force or monarch or elite. The tories on the other hand are content with the king and upheld that the rule of many by the few was divinely ordained. Now it's true there were many variations and there were certain degrees of belief among all of them, both sides. I'm sure that some of the radicals, the revolutionists would have settled for just an increased voice, some of them by the people's representatives in government and they would have been content to go along with the king. The Tories ranged from a belief in royal omnipotence to a willingness I'm sure on the part of some of them to strive for a better treatment of the colonial subjects by the king. And no better example of these variations exists than the conflict that took place at the Constitutional Convention between Jefferson and Hamilton over the individual freedom and local rule as opposed to the idea of a strong

central government, and yet even as they even as they debated and argued this, Hamilton said, "Give all the power to the many and they will oppress the few, and give all the power to the few, and they will oppress the many." And he said both therefore ought to have that power that each may defend himself against the others. And he concluded saying, " Real liberty is never found in the despotism of the extremes of democracy."

Well now aren't we on safe ground to continue this point about defining to say that the conservative today is characterized by advocating less control of the people by government, less centralization actually of authority. Likewise, the liberal today supports the idea that the problems can only be solved by government, preferably the federal government. As a matter of fact the only common denominator needed to win the support of the liberals all too often is just the extent to which it will involve the government in the solution of the peoples affairs. Now, I think danger lies in the so-called liberal willingness to sacrifice individual freedom because of a feeling that the material needs of the people are more important and thus the end justifies the means, and this particular phrase is probably the greatest immorality of the enemy in the world today, and it certainly makes a mockery of any attempt at law and order. The end can never justify the means.

Now one comment more on extremism. If the liberal is characterized by the belief in the federalization of much of our government processes, and I believe that that's a fair assumption, then liberalism carried to extremism would pass successively through the planning and controls of the great society to a modified Marxism as we find in the Scandinavian countries and

76

today in England, to the ultra-extremism the totalitarianism that we find in the Soviet. This is the ultimate in left-wingism. But doesn't this also include, if we go that far, the totalitarianism of Hitler, and Mussolini so often used as terrific examples of the far right. Doesn't the Klu-Klux Klansman and any of those others who would deny individual freedoms on the basis of race or religion, or national origin, are they not in reality advocates of government control? Do they not properly belong over in that classification with those people who would carry extremism to the point of excess control.

Now let's carry conservatism to the point of extremism. Since the conservative believes in the individual freedom, and the limited power of government carried to extremism this would go through more and more laissez-faire, ultimately to no law and order and thus extremism on that side would be anarchy. Now this hardly fits our very comfortable cliches about the right wing and the left wing or even the middle of the road. Is there a left or a right? Well, it makes more sense to say no, there isn't. There's only an up or down. Up to the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with law and order or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism, and no matter how noble or humane the motives those who would trade freedom for some fancy material security are embarked on that downward course. Now the founding fathers knew this. These men were ordinary citizens, all of them. They were students of history. They were not politicians among them. And they created what is still today the nearest and the most unique idea and experiment in the history of man's relation to man. Now personally I subscribe to a belief that there is more than coincidence. That there was a divine scheme, a divine plan that put this continent between the oceans, to be discovered

by people who had some extra spark of courage, and some extra love of freedom, and then brought together a little band of founding fathers so advanced beyond their years and their time that the world has never seen their like before or since.

Thomas Jefferson, prior to writing the Declaration of Independence, spoke some words that are now inscribed in the base of Jefferson Memorial. "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty." Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? The declaration they signed was unequivocal in its assertion that every man had inalienable rights to life, liberty and the freedom of choice they decided conferred upon him at birth by the creator, but whether you choose to go along with the divine concept or not, it is still the basis of this country and of that declaration that man's rights were his by birth, and then they augmented this by drawing up the U. S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Seventy years later, England's Lord Acton, the same Lord Acton that said that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely, would say of their effort that they had solved with astonishing and unexampled success two problems which heretofore baffled the capacity of the most enlightened nations. They had contrived a system of federal government which prodigiously increased national power and yet respected local liberties and authorities and they had founded it on the principles of equality with out surrendering securities for properties and freedom.

Well now his Lordship would find today no quarrel with his idea about the prodigious increase in the national power, but I think he'd

78

have to fish pretty far to find, and he'd be a little concerned at his inability to find what's happened to local liberty and authority and the security for property and freedom, because somewhere a perversion has taken place. Our rights are now deemed to be a dispensation of government and they have been made divisible by majority vote. Now majority rule is a suitable mechanism for administering our affairs. But only if it's controlled by a set of ground rules. The high sounding phrases "one man one vote" or the "greatest good for the greatest number", high sounding though they are, they in reality mean 50% of the people plus one can impose upon the rest of the people simply because they outnumber them, and this without the ground rules, is nothing more than mob rule.

Now this is the unique heritage that has come to each one of us, and soon will be coming to you. One's right to life, liberty the freedom of worship, the freedom to meet, the freedom to stand and to speak as I'm speaking are in short our unalienable God given rights, may not be submitted to a vote. The very purpose of the Bill of Rights was to forever put them beyond the reach of majority rule. Now in other countries, even in the Soviet Union, there are constitutions, and sometimes it would seem they are very similar to ours in the guarantees they give to the people, and so you're inclined to say, well where in lies the difference? Well the difference is so subtle that it almost escapes us, but at the same time it's so great it tells the entire story. In all too many of these cases, their constitutions say that government grants you this right, and our constitution says you are born with this right and no government has the right to take it from you. And, government can have no other source of power than the sovereign people. We therefore, can

only give to the government the powers that we possess as individuals. And there's a new philosophy abroad in the land, however. Men in high place in government question the ability of the people to control their own destiny. They chafe under constitutional restraints and they're impatient with the slow pace that's been provided for altering by amendment, so they embark on the dangerous folly of changing by judicial interpretation. Lowell Mason, a former anti-trust law enforcement officer has written in his book the language of desent. In this country one sees a growing acceptance of the thesis that the violation of the economic demands of the state are more dangerous to our material welfare than criminal offenses and therefore can be punished without due process. Today the search of homes, seeking a suspect for murder would still require a search warrant, but this no longer troubles the federal government agencies with regard to the violation of certain government regulations. The government agents can come in without such a warrant, and can make a search, can impose a fine without a formal hearing. They can imprison farmers and sell farms at auction for violation of government regulations. The federal government competes with privately owned business. It uses the harassing power of internal revenue service, the anti-trust laws and actually the withholding or granting of defense spending to punish businessmen for raising prices to meet increased cost of production. Taxation itself is used not as an equitable means of raising revenue which the constitution provides, but to control the economy, to be an actual factor in the market play. Some in government a little bolder, have suggested that the constitution is outmoded and unsuitable for this modern age.

But before we toss it aside too soon, let's heed the words of Nathaniel Webster who said: "Who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government, who shall rear again the well proportioned columns of constitutional liberty, who shall fit together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with states rights, individual security, and public prosperity. Now, once you and I could have counted on the not inconsiderable power of states, of state governments to resist the erosion of the constitution if only to protect their own state's sovereignty. As the the philosophy I have mentioned has spread and as the states have sold their birth right for a supposedly free federal handout, we see an increasing tendency to let the states become mere administrative districts of the federal government. When I use that term supposedly in regard to a free federal handout, I want you to know that in getting my own degree in economics I learned in college a lesson that didn't help me at all in English, but it sure made sense economically. There ain't no such thing as free lunch. Now, ^{if} it's true that I've said about this administrative district idea in California, Federal employees outnumber state employees in thirty of fifty states including California. In the case of our state, that's not easy. We've been increasing state employees 2 1/2 times as fast as the increase in population. The increased cost of government becomes a burden and as the state bureaucracy grows and control of the government by the people becomes less and less; empire building leads to extravagant and wasteful incompetence.

California's pro rata share of state and local government today, each individual share runs \$100.00 higher than the national average. We've just been presented with a budget for four billion etc. You know I've been around at this budget. It took us a hundred years to get to a

81

billion dollar budget in California and it only took us nine years to double that to two, and now in the last eight years, it has gone from two to the four billion six now proposed. And I remember when, a few years ago, when the budget began to get above the three billion mark they adopted a custom in Sacramento of descriptively naming the budget. One of them was "stringent," then as it went up the next year it was "stare." This was followed by "Frugal," and last year was "bare bones," and I have an uncomfortable feeling we know who's bones are bare. I thought they'd run out of names that they couldn't come up with another one, but this one now has been called "Learna' Hard," and that's what they're doing - learnin' hard.

But you and I would have a right to expect as the budget gets to this figure, the highest in the nation, that it would represent something of complete honesty and impeccable computing and certainly would be shaded down to the exact minimum that the people should have to put up in order to get the service that the people are supposed to require. But this budget has been characterized by incompetence and sloppiness and I believe that this is typical, not of any purpose or anyone's bad motives. I think it is something typical and inherent as government begins to grow beyond the consent of the government. For example there is in this budget a two million dollar typographical error. Now I wouldn't mind if it was our way, but it's two million dollars going up, and I have a strange feeling that as bureaus and government agencies make their plans based on this budget, they'll find the use for that 2 million dollar typographical error. It's there in black and white and they'll use it. You see, governments don't tax to get the money they need. Governments always find a need for the money they get.

Now the State Office of Planning is provided in the budget. Now this is a very important agency. It's not opposed to all bills. This is the agency

82

entrusted with the master plan for the good of California. With this rapid growth of ours this is only one upon which our plans for the future are based. Our development of schools, highways and planning of all kinds - they were supposed to come up with Phase 1 of the master plan in 1963 and phase 2 in sixty four and to complete the plan by this coming September. We've spent four million dollars on that agency and they have not yet shown up with phase 1, but this budget provides another five hundred thousand dollars for them, maybe to go look for phase 1. But I can go beyond that, I don't, I have been critical of the increased cost of welfare that has more than doubled in the last five years. Now, let me again make one thing plain. I divide welfare into two segments. I have no complaint indeed I have a great deal of pride and I'm sure that every Californian does in our ability to provide subsistence, but some of the aspects that make life worth living for those people who truly must depend on their fellow citizens. But there is another danger, another half of welfare in which it's a kind of a dead end street. We are doing the age old mistake of perpetuating poverty with a goal instead of using that same money to cure and end poverty and find ways through training and education to make people self sustaining. And yet with all of the cost, and I think it should be reduced, I think there's some kind of an insult added to injury when you discover in the swollen budget that there's two million dollars set marked for administrative salaries and two welfare programs that don't even exist. We have two medical welfare programs and the administrative cost of those programs was two million dollars. It's still allocated for the year 1966 and 67 and those two agencies as a result of well-care went out of existence as of March first. Two million dollars will help a lot of people a long time.

83

Hasn't the time come once again to look at that dream of the founding fathers? The idea that government is a convenience of the people. I'm sure that some of you have guessed by now that I'm a purist. I would sell the post office, wipe out the public schools, blow up the freeways. There have been moments when that last idea is not bad. And let me make it plain. I'm a staid old fellow who believes that the government has a legitimate place in our lives. The government must provide a frame work for our daily competition with each other to make sure that in our pursuit of happiness, we don't, it doesn't result in misery for someone else. It would be extraneous to deny, as I said before, our responsibility for the less fortunate. But government must never become a substitute for the people. If the complexity of our society is so enormous, where would we find geniuses to serve us at the government level, capable of making even the multitude of decisions that are necessary to every day just in the market place alone. The truth is only the people have the capacity to manage their affairs and this is even more true as society grows more complex and the people grow more numerous. Now there's no question but that the great society can accomplish its goals, goals I might add which you and I can have no quarrel, but I don't think you'll like the price that we'll pay in lost freedom. And how if it isn't government planning, and it isn't laissez-faire or the share voluntarism, what alternative is there? Well there is the implementation of self government. I think we have to leave the nineteenth century concept and that's what it really is, whether you call it feudalism or Marxism, or Monarchy or anything else, it is 19th century to believe that there is some elite even an intellectual elite that can run the peoples affairs and make the decisions for them. I'd like to suggest we move into the 20th century and I think that we can do this with what I've chosen to call the

the creative society, mobilizing the full resources of the people. They use their creative energies and abilities to solve the problems confronting us. This country's been fighting the most successful war on poverty that the world has ever seen. We've been doing for 200 of the 6,000 years of recorded history. I think we have the energy and the ability on the part of our people to solve indeed every problem that confronts us is being solved somewhere. The cases are legion if you go out and look for them and find them. Now I don't mean again that you just turn people loose and say find the problems and solve them. No, I envision government, a state government if you will, mobilizing these energies of the people, turning to the people in the various segments where the problems exist and saying you, you with, and naming perhaps finding these people that you believe are capable of organizing the rest and say find and draft the best brains you have.

Take in the area of our declining business climate. Turn to the industrial community and say "I want the best brains. I want you to tell me in government why is the business climate deteriorating. What is going on that is causing the cancellation of new plant openings in California causing plants to leave California that is resulted in us having employment 40% higher than in the rest of the nation? Is there someplace where government is restricting unnecessarily, demanding regressive taxation, demanding needless record keeping. Is there an area where we could perhaps stimulate prosperity with incentive taxation, and then find out how government and the private sector of the community working together can do what only the private sector can do and that is provide productive jobs and put an end to the nagging problem

of unemployment that has been hanging over us these many years. I think in the same way, in the great field of human misunderstanding, I think there's a limit to how far we can go with rules and regulations and new laws. I think the time now has come for people to face each other, to face not only face to face, but heart to heart, to meet and find out the depth of each others problems, the depth of our misunderstanding to find not the one because there's not had easy single answer to this problem, but all the answers that can eventually wear away and make this problem disappear from our midst. There are simple ones in the field of law. I think from years back we've been plagued by the proscription of this judicial process in the political appointment of judges. There is a plan at work in the state of Missouri. I would like to suggest something similar to this in California. You've turned to the men of the legal profession and say you, form a committee of lawyers from the bar association qualified men and also a committee of laymen and you then come up with a panel of qualified legal minds that you in your best opinion believe qualified to be judges and the judges must be appointed by the Governor from that panel and take the political partisanship out of the appointment of judges once and for all time. Daniel Webster said nothing can save the country if the people leave the fate of the country in any hands but their own, and nothing can harm the country if the people will retain in their own hands the safety of the country." And this I do believe very deeply, as I believe that our government, created by ordinary citizens is meant to be run by ordinary citizens. I am not a politician; and not being a politician, I just believe that the time has come to bring the common sense of rank and file citizens thinking through the halls of government, perhaps a little fresh air from the people who've been living under the roof and capitol, might just be helpful sometime in the process to say "ouch!" in the halls of government to let them know what it's like in the great outside world.

Q. (Can you explain what happened last Sunday)

A. Yes, I'd be very happy to. It was last Saturday, last Saturday afternoon. I got mad. I did not get mad at the questions. I did not get mad at the fifty delegates that were there. I was angry at my two fellow candidates and the answers they had been giving to the questions during the afternoon. Now, I've been going up and down the state speaking to Republican groups and pleading for unity. Some of you might have heard a slight rumor that there are divisions and splits within the Republican Party. I found that there is some substance to the rumor and I'm trying to pledge unity and that idea that I will and I still mean this- I am still pledged to this. I will support whoever is the candidate because I believe very strongly in the need for a regress of the imbalance in the 2 party system, but in the afternoon, and it has not been quite accurately reported, what actually happened was that a question was asked. I did not disrupt the meeting or leave before the meeting was over. The question being asked was the final question of the day and it had been announced as such. The other two has already answered and I was the last to answer and I completed the answer to the question and then because I'm not a politician, and as I say I'm still pledged to unity, and I haven't answered back to anything, I just felt that maybe they've got some special ground rules in politics, but I think there are some things that are implied about you personally, if you're a man, you'll resent. And I informed them that I resented the implication in their answer that each time had given me the feeling that they were indicating that I belonged over in the side of bigotry and racism. Now there was no direct charge and get me plain, this was I felt an inference, coming as a threat, and I spoke certainly of my resentment, and I left the hall, but I stayed in a hospitality suite they maintained to

81

entertain some of the delegates that came by. We talked for the remainder of the period that I was supposed to be there and that was that.

Q. Now would I use the Creative Society approach to solving the Delano Grape Strike?

A. Well once again, I think again you have to turn to the people who are involved and I think I know a great deal about the farm situation. I am a farmer and I know something about it here in California. I wasn't affected by the decision. I'm in cattle and horses. I know that there is a great feeling on the part of the farm committee, and this is the biggest single industry in the state of California. One out of three jobs are in one way or another related to agriculture and 70% of all the cash transactions in the state are identified with agriculture. And the farmer has a feeling that for some time, there has been no audience in Sacramento. There is a wall that he can't penetrate around the capitol, and he wants a voice there and he wants a hearing for his problems, and here again I think you should turn not only to labor, because they're involved, but to the man associated with farming and with the allied industries to farming for a solution to this problem. Now the problem is very simple. Four years ago Governor Brown opened his campaign for re-election pledging to the California farmers a guarantee of an adequate labor force "including braceros" and that was four years ago. Now he expressed a disagreement before the present constellation went into effect and said that he would have favored phase out to determine if there was an adequate labor force without braceros, but it is that I meant in my remarks about state government not opposing the federal government.

when it makes it will know. There was no protest in the part of this state in the cancellation when it took place and the catastrophe in the farming community was only averted in its full scale by unusual weather. Now we're the home of unusual weather in California. This is the only place in the world where you can fall asleep under a rose bush in full bloom and freeze to death. But this summer we had a cool summer that stretched out the harvesting season, and the crops didn't overlap in their ripening as they usually do, so a limited work force in many instances could move from one crop to the other. But even so, it wasn't big enough. There were farmers totally wiped out. Riverside County has issued its complete figures for the county, and there were eight crops in Riverside County that showed a net loss, while Riverside County was having the biggest gross agriculture in its history. Now the Governor has boasted that 3.7 billion, our agricultural gross was record breaking. Now it was, but it was the lowest net to the farmers since 1931. The cost of food stuffs in the country has gone up \$331 per capita in the last several years and the farmer has only received \$3.00 of that \$331. Now I think there's something very wrong in the farmer situation, and I don't think the answer is picket lines and I don't think the answer is professional hierarchy of labor that is up there regardless of the will of the people who are involved the farmers or the workers involved, seeking to unionize and for us the protect unionization. I want you to know that I am a believer in collective bargaining. I spent more than twenty years on the board of the union and was six times president, and I was in charge for those twenty years of negotiations with the professors for the basic contracts and I defy anyone to say that the unions haven't done for their working conditions and wage minimums of any

Industry . But this is a long way around. I try not to do that all the time. Again, you must turn to the people who know, and get their thinking on the answer. This does not mean you are bound by it if they want the sky or something you obviously cannot do without unfairly imposing on other segments of the economy, you don't do it, but you try to work out a sensible solution. The only other thing I want to say about that weather in the harvesting - right at the end of the season the Governor and the Secretary of Labor might have been caught. There was an unseasonable rain as the peaches ripened and in 24 hours one third of the California crop was totally destroyed, and there's this fungus disease, a fungus spore on the peaches that if the weather, the rain hits it, moisture hits it at exactly the right moment, they rot and there's nothing that can be done with them. This disease is known in the trade appropriately enough as ground round.

Q. Former Mayor George Christopher stated that if elected he would probably(?) What would you say concerning these two plans?

A. Oh, he'd got no disagreement with me, in fact I want to go a third step farther. I think that there is even more investigation needed, and more findings of the same nature. There is a great streamline that is due in government, the things that I mentioned in my talk, to eliminate such things as still budgeting for two bureaus that have disappeared. We, it was announced officially in Sacramento that there is no way to count the number of bureaus, agencies and commissions in the executive branch of the state government, but it counted up to 276 and 53 of those were created in just the last few years, and obviously there is some streamlining that is needed, and no disagreement whatsoever on that.

90

Q. Could you comment on Mayor Novoy's gubernatorial candidacy?

A. You know with all he's got to do unclinging Viet Nam, you wonder how he's got time. You know I'll tell you, I'm just happy to see that other people have got troubles too. Mickey loves company and I think it'll just be a fine time to observe. As a matter of fact if it shows any signs of cooling off I may throw an ether on the fire myself.

Q. How could your Creative Society solve the problems of the urban ghetto caused by poverty?

A. Of course I know you are referring to the whole problem we had here such as is now threatening in Oakland, the problem we had here in our own South-central area. First of all, you put your finger on one thing. I think a great deal of the problem is economic, and I think we're going to make the greatest inroads on that problem if we solve the economic problems, and bring about equality of opportunity just as fully and as much as we can, equality of job opportunities. Now, I'd like to point out here an example of the creative society at work and they didn't wait for me. There was a man in this town by the name of Chad Mc Clellan who was inspired and right after the Watts riot, he mobilized the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. Now this is a dirty name in some circles, the Chamber of Commerce sounds like Rabbit, but these men mobilized to begin with more than a hundred of the industries in the Los Angeles area, and he by just the sheer persuasive power of presenting a case that was irrefutable to them said "Look, it is our problem." They said the providing of jobs is the problem of private industry and it's private industry's responsibility to show the people that it has more to offer than government or the govt and he got these men to pledge, not only jobs, but continued to mobilize for a while. There's one other thing. While we have an excess over the country of unemployed in California due to the post-bummers all are, basically in the nation there is a lack of jobs. There is a lack of job titles for the 3 million people who are unemployed.

91

in the country there are 3 million jobs looking for workers, but the people are not trained as our technology has moved along they haven't caught up with this need. But they moved into this area, opened an office, and they mobilized a committee of fine responsible Negro businessmen who are providing the people and with all the talk that the government's been doing, these men almost immediately had it catalogued. There are about 25,000 unemployed in that area. Roughly half of these are unemployable at the moment even with on the job training for a variety of reasons - illiteracy, criminal records, disability, whatever. This is a social problem. This is all our problem to be solved by the government and the people, again as I say, in a dozen ways, from remedial education to starting down at the beginning and getting a better start in school, all these things, but about half of them were employable, most if given some on the job training and to date they have put between two and three thousand men in such jobs, Voluntarily. Now when government heard of this and moved in out here, the government came at them in three directions. Three separate programs each one of them in there as if it was sneaking in the back door to compete with the other two, and find out how we could get in on the act. There is a necessary cooperation and a certain subsidy needed in on the job training from many industries, and they having started, having the jobs available and promised were able to say to these three government agencies, "Look boys, you go out and find a room and get married, and you come back to us when you're willing to talk how you, the government, together can cooperate with us, but don't come in here competing with each other and saying, "G'n't pay any attention to him, listen to me." And government is doing this, and as I say two to three thousand already have been provided and they are already enlisting

92

and expanding and the idea of making this a permanent thing for the entire megalopolis area here, moving into the East of Los Angeles where there is an unemployment problem and solving it in that way. Now this is only one phase, of the economic phase. Incidentally if you think two to three thousand jobs is not important, this is almost as easy as there are poverty program administrators running up and down the streets looking.

Now the churches here in Los Angeles a couple of weeks ago got together with a program they'd been working with Negro Clergymen and Negro and White churches got together and formed a family to family program, an exchange of visits in each others homes to get personally acquainted and find out the other fellow's problems. Cause, you know, maybe this is oversimplification, but oh boy, how much trouble in the world would disappear if we would start talking to each other and stop talking about each other.

I went down the other day and visited a program that was started by some fine young Negro men, one of them an official of court, called Operation Bootstrap. Now this was aimed at that other side. This was aimed at those people who at the moment are not ready for this on the job training, and their ideas are great and they have a well thought out program. Their needs are great. ✓ It's going to take financing and it's going to a lot of help to get this going, but they've got an old abandoned garage building that they've set up shop and they're working in, and they're dealing just with an 8 block area, that they've personally canvassed and it's a very exciting thing to see and it's going to be heart breaking if this falls by the way side just for a lack of support from people. ✓ It deserves the help of all of us to get it off the ground. The day I was there there was a young fellow who was working on an automobile fender repair that a near by garage had brought in. The fellow who owned it couldn't afford the regular garage rates and this man brought the, so that this fellow

Q3

learning body and funder repair. We'll have a trade out of this. These things should not be allowed to die.

Q.(?) What conclusions have you come to about this?

A. Well, my research is about as infallible a source as I could come to. First of all, I got ten and a half pounds of the budget itself, and that's a paper back you could not send to Hanoi, unless we're going to drop it on Hanoi. But then I got a book about this thick which is Mr. Alan Post, the legislative analyst. First analysis of the budget which as you can imagine had to be pretty hasty in the limited time he's had access to the budget. But Alan Post is Non-Partisan and is employed by the state legislator, and he's our watch dog hired by them and he interprets or I mean he analyzes the budget and his findings are printed and it is from this that the legislature bases its decision with regard to approval or disapproval of various aspects of the budget, and he is the authority for the typographical error, for the two million dollars that I've mentioned and the Planning Commission and I was very kind tonight because I could have gone into great detail about what he found out about the staff in the governor's office which has grown quite fast too and I didn't even mention that. I figured this was non-partisan, but that and of course there are other sources, but this is the principal source of the figures that I've used here tonight.

Q. ?

A. Well I know that they're using, as government has increasingly used, the federal government, they're using the power of punishment of withholding

federal funds because of this. I think this is an issue you've just got to see what the court decides. Either the could act as back enforcement implemented or Proposition 14 as it stands and then with regard to any action by the federal government that would of course be between the federal government and private business concerns and I don't think there'd be any place there for the state government could intervene or have a voice. When I say the state government could protest to the federal government, I'm talking about such things as the Brasserio decision, I'm talking about such things as down in the Imperial Valley, the federal government has broken more than a thirty year agreement with the farmers down there and told them that they must now come under the 160 acre limitation on irrigated farms even though their water right preceded the federal governments water right and they have for more than thirty years had a kind of contract of agreement with the federal government and not been bound. First of all I think the government has an obligation to stand up on behalf of the citizens and throw the full power of this state into a protest. We cannot do this to our citizens.

*Q. ?

A. Well, I don't think there is a discrepancy. A political party basically has a general philosophy, and you align yourself with the party who's philosophy you believe most nearly fits your beliefs and you appeal to the people in that party to begin with in an attempt to get the nomination by stating your philosophy and belief, and they either agree that this is what they conceive is the party's philosophy enough to go along with the or they don't. I was a Democrat most of my life and left that party when I

felt that actually the party had taken a turn in its philosophy and was no longer the party that I had joined, as a matter of fact, I think the next time the Democrats have their Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, the Republicans ought to attend. I think that Jefferson belongs to us.

No, I believe in this instance, here in California, there's nothing that involves or implies that you're a politician by choosing to align yourself with a party. I have been supporting that party and candidates for the last three elections and have gone all over the country and the state campaigning because of my belief that this offers the best vehicle for restoration of constitutional limits on the power of government. Let me just add that in California, some of these eastern editorialists who like to point out that we're so ridiculous here, that California doesn't make sense. Well, it doesn't make sense by people who have become so apathetic that they are willing to abide by dictates of machine politics, particularly big city machine politics, and we don't have this in California. Thank heaven we don't have it and we don't have it because of a man who also is not a politician to begin with, a governor who marked this state as no other governor has marked any state, Ivan Johnson. He was a trial lawyer and he became governor at a time when California was controlled by bossism, was corrupt, was literally owned by certain big business and he freed it and he established certain principles that have kept since that time the politics of the state in the hands of the people. In the east they say if you're going to run for office you have to go in a smoke filled room and a machine agrees or disagrees with whether you're the candidate. Out here, you gotta take your case to the people. You have to do what I'm doing at a primary

You have to present yourself and the people will make the decision.

That's the way it should be.

Q. /?

A. I'll have to make this as quick as possible. You did not present anything to me sir that has not been on my mind for quite some time. I'm well aware of everything you said. First of all, I would hope that if we that if we had a victory, we could regress the imbalance somewhat, that we would be a little closer to the opposition and legislative power than we are now. If you at least can limit them to simple majority, you've got one victory, because of the number of things that require a 2/3 majority.

Now the other thing is this. First of all, on some legislation this legislature has shown its willingness to cross party lines. A good major public assembly man from Long Beach introduced three crime measures in the last session, three very good measures that would have gone a long way toward helping our law enforcement officers to protect society instead of the other way around. These good bills were so good they overwhelmingly passed the assembly and the senate and they were pocket vetoed by the government, but remember they did pass the legislature. Now it is true that I can see this gentleman up there trying to ham string the governor of the opposition party. It is also true that number one, the governor can do a lot of appointing and all these bureaus and agencies. His philosophy can be reflected in the management and the running of these bureaus and agencies. The governor has a blue pencil. It goes with the job. He can take that budget and he cannot eliminate anything completely. That calls for legislation, but he can blue pencil it down to the cent on the dollar. The other thing is this.

97

If it comes to a real hard case of something that the governor believes is for the good of the people, and he has been stopped on a purely partisan standpoint on the part of the speaker for the assembly, Mr. Monroe, then I think that the governor can go to the people and state his case to the people and I think I've got some fair qualifications for doing that, and I think that the governor then says to the people this is bill, this is what we are trying to do. This is why it is being blocked and here are the people that are blocking it, and then you come down to assemblymen and Senators, beholdings to voters who can only go so far in ignoring the will of the people if the will of the people is expressed to them strongly enough. Now as to Mr. Monroe(?) being a politician, I grant you he is, but I want to say one thing on my own behalf. I had some people suggest that if he and I were in a room together, one of us might come out without his trousers and it might be me. But damn it, in my own defence let me tell you this one thing. Jack in those twenty odd years in the guild I sat across the table from some not exactly unsmart fellows like Jack and Harry Warner and Louis B. Mayer and Harry Cohen and somehow I never had to go home in a barrel and I don't think that Jessie can be as completely that much smarter than a lot of those fellows. And so I'll take my chances.

98

CALIFORNIA COUNCIL FOR ADULT EDUCATION

International Hotel

12 March 1966

Presidents, incoming and outgoing, Messrs. Hathaway and Lacey, Ladies and Gentlemen, you realize that you struck a kindred note with me when you began announcing those absenteisms because of the flu. Those poor people don't know what is in store for them. I assure you that I am no longer contagious, as a matter of fact I am supposed to be well. That is the nice thing, if you haven't had it yet, about the flu, you get up and go about your business and you can look forward to going back to bed again. In my case twice, and I'm going back for the third time when I leave here tonight but I'm not going to tell you about my operation. You know it is a wonderful thing - a speaker has to guard against being in a position of seeming to give advice. I've always found that in trying to warn myself against that I always try to recall the three sentence essay that was written by a small girl, very brief, but it contained that irreputable feminine logic that is so maddening if you are in a quarrel at home. She wrote on Socrates. She said Socrates was a Greek, he went around giving free advice and they poisoned him. I am sorry that Nancy couldn't be here but in addition to my condition, another little emergency at home has her there with the children. It has been a very exciting and wonderful new world that I seem to be at least dipping my toes into and it has been exciting for Nancy too. She has learned to make speeches in the tub. She figures it is the only place that is safe for the people she wants to talk to and what she wants to say to them and it has served the purpose that when she finally emerges she is not only cleansed but she has rid herself of some frustrations and she can then love her audience. Skipper, our 7 yr. old, has a very simplified approach

to the whole thing. He doesn't understand why I have to go on these trips and go around speaking. He has been watching Death Valley Days. He figures I just ought to go to Sacramento and stand in the middle of the street and say, "Pat, one of us has got to be out of town by camp." Well now that might be an over-simplification of the problem but it came in to say that perhaps all of us are guilty of over-complicating some problems. Now I'm not going to stand here and attempt to talk to you on the purpose that has brought you together for the purposes of your association. That is always the wrong thing to talk about, I think, to come in and try to be an expert in the other field! On the other hand, while a speaker always tries to establish some common meeting grounds, some rapport, perhaps we do have one with the subject I am going to talk about because it is going to deal with a citizen's role. I have embarked on a kind of a citizen participation kind of politics and you have been embarked for a very long time very definitely in a citizen's role. I know this is probably very old to you and you deal with a very serious side of a problem dealing with our adults, but the wonderful thing in America is we can always have a little sense of humor about it. Do you know the story about the fellow who couldn't make it through college? Mathematics was his downfall and finally as the years went by though he invented a little gadget in his garage and now, as quite a multi-millionaire, he gave a \$500,000.00 grant to the college and they awarded him an honorary degree, the only kind he could get as he couldn't make the other kind. Talking afterwards, the President of the College said to him, "It is just wonderful, to see how life turns out and what happens." He said, "Here you were, and the difficulties you had in school, you wanted to go to school so badly and now you are gifting the college in this way. How do you explain it?" He said, "Well, be realy it is just part of what I learned here. I figured out that gadget in the garage and I carried a thing it on the market and I could make them for \$1.00 and sell them for \$1.00 and like you taught me you just stay with them until they sell 25."

To get back to the problems we over-complicate. I sometimes think that an awful lot of us in this country today, if not the world, are sort of like a writer who has come to a great plot problem and is really stuck and doesn't know how to make it work and finally goes back and does a little studying of the pages previously written and discovers that maybe the plot was based on a false premise. There is no way to make it come out until you correct that. First, let me try to cut through some semantics on some of the problems that bother us today. Everybody, it seems, comes today complete with a hyphen, even among the clergy you are a social gospel-clergy, or you are a fundamentalist. In economics, for which I have received my own degree, today you are either a Keynesian-economist, or you are a traditionalist-economist, and everybody, of course, all the lalty, must be properly pigeonholed as conservative, or liberal, or moderate, or ultra this, or left wing, or right wing. I think those labels, those general labels demand a little discussion. Now, the risk of being partisan - I introduce this not for that note but only because I think that in the area of semantics somebody revealed a kind of double standard of thinking here. The Chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Coke, was asked a question the other day - "How would your party feel with extremist groups?" And he said, "Well, at this moment I know of no single group within our party that poses any particular kind of problem from the point-of-view of extremism." He said, "I'm quite certain that the Right Wing influence of the Republican Party will be a major topic for most Democratic candidates for office." This is then where the double standard was revealed. He said "The strength of the Democratic Party is its diversity and the Republicans will not become strong unless they learn to accommodate diversity" and I wanted to say "We're trying."

Basically, I'd like to talk about those two most common labels that seem to divide us right down the middle, today's Conservative, and the Liberal. Today's Conservative, actually because there has been a change of meaning as we all know, was really the Radical of Revolutionary Days in the beginning of this Country and I would think it is safe to say that those who advocate the more Liberal philosophy, in that day would have been Tories. Now, before you take exception to that, let me point out that the Revolutionists were Conservatives in the Edmund Burke Conservation. Reasoned philosophy directed toward control of the forces of change in such a way as to conserve the best elements of the past by blending them into an organic unity with new elements in an ever-revolving society. But they were Revolutionists and they were radicals remarkably similar to today's so-called Conservatives in that they wanted local rule, they wanted a lessening of centralized authority and they wanted as much individual freedom as it was possible to have. Now, the Tories of that day, of course, wanted the perpetuation of rule by the King, as I believe the Liberals of today want an increase in the Centralized Power, the Government. Indeed the only common denominator sometimes that seems to be required to get the Liberal support of proposed legislation is the extent to which it will empower the Federal Government to take action. Now, it is true that much of what the Liberal wants, and I mean this sincerely as inspired by humanitarianism; there is no question about that. A concern for material welfare and the lack of an answer to so many of the problems brought on by age and disease and poverty and deprivation, have tempted all too many of us out onto the thin ice of the end justifying the means. Of course, you will know that there can be no law and order if we ever subscribe to that philosophy that is so much a tenant of the secular nature of the Soviet. Now, let us take one aspect of Federalism - if the Liberal is characterized by a belief in Federalism, such a Federal Government procedure,

I believe that is a fair assumption, I want to talk about this confusing thing of tagging people and sticking them out on extreme fringes. If we carry Liberalism to Extremism, don't you pass successfully through the planning and the controls of the great society on to an even more controlled society, similar to the modified Marxism of the Scandinavian Countries and England, under the Labor Government, and going on to further Extremism in that direction, you must eventually come to the Totalitarianism of the Soviet Union, the ultimate in Left Wingism. But doesn't this also, if you are going to do that, don't we suddenly discover the Totalitarianism of Hitler, the Corporate State of Mussolini, used as specific examples of the Far Right, don't they, in reality, belong over there, beside the Totalitarianism of the Soviet? Doesn't such a thing as the Ku Klux Klan belong over on the Right because would it not have some people check God given rights on the basis of race, religion, or national origin? Would they not invoke the power of Government to restrict the freedom of some individuals?

Well, now let's get to Conservatism and carry that to Extremism and since it believes in the individual freedom, the limited power of Government, it would, if carried to Extremism, go through more and more less affair, it would move on over ultimately to arriving at no law and order or complete anarchy. Unfortunately, this doesn't fit our comfortable cliché about the Right Wing and the Left Wing Extremists, or even the Middle of the Road, so I would like to pose for your consideration the list, with the questions as to whether there is a Left or a Right. I wonder if it doesn't make more sense to say there is only an Up or Down. Now the Up is to the Ultimate individual freedom consistent with law and order, and the Down, no matter how often the human motives, have shown to result from its failure over Early Medieval Society, have worked in a downward path because it leads down to the ultimate Totalitarianism.

I think the founding fathers knew this. These men were ordinary citizens - all of them, students of history. There were no politicians among them. They created what I believe is still the most unique idea in all the long history of man's relation to man. I must confess to you that personally I subscribe to the belief that there is more than coincidence in this country, being established here between the two causes, to be found by people who have an extra spark of courage and love of freedom. I think there was a kind of divine plan in it. Then, brought together on this continent with that little band I have mentioned, the founding fathers, who were so advanced beyond their time that the world has never seen the like since. The declaration that they signed was unequivocally the assertion that every man had alienable rights to life, liberty and freedom of choice conferred on him at birth by the Creator. They suggested this declaration by drawing up the Constitution of the Bill of Rights. Seventy years after they performed this task an Englishman, Lord Atkins, the same one who coined the phrase "Power Corrupts and absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely". With comment on the work they had done, Lord Atkins said they had solved with astonishing and unexampled success two problems which had heretofore baffled the capacity of the most enlightened agent. They had contrived the system of Federal Government which prodigiously increased national power and yet respected local liberties and authorities and they had founded it on a principal of equality without surrendering securities for property and freedom. I think his Lordship today would find there is no quarrel with the idea of the prodigious increase of National Power. I think he would have to look a little farther for what happened to local liberty and authority and those securities for property and freedom. Somewhere there seems to have been a perversion has taken place. Our inalienable rights are now deemed to be a dispensation of government and they are made divisible by majority vote. A majority rule is suitable machinery for administering the affairs of the nation, or any other organization, but only if we have a set of ground rules - high & noble principles,

one man, one vote, the greatest good for the greatest number, hard at first hearing to quarrel with, but if you analyze them properly, don't they really mean that 50% of the people, plus 1, will do anything they choose to the rest, simply because they are in the majority. This is mob rule. This is the unique heritage that we have in this country, a set of ground rules, our right to life, with liberty, to speak, to assemble, to worship, to doing what we are here tonight, in short - our inalienable God given rights, may not be submitted to a vote. That was the very purpose of the Bill of Rights that forever put them beyond the reach of the majority rule. Other countries have constitutions but almost without exception and they seem very similar, in many ways, to our own but almost without exception there is a fundamental difference that is so subtle that it almost gets by and escapes us as we find ourselves saying: "But where are we so different?" And yet it is so great that it tells the whole story. Almost all the other constitutions say: "The Government grants you this right." Ours says: "You are born with this right. The Government can't take it away from you." Now I think it would be foolish to deny that our country is deeply split philosophically. On the one hand the Government controls the planning and on the other more voluntarism and self-government. One side is very prone to charge the other with engaging in a plot with some representatives of one side, using the welfare state for some as a device to bring on statism and collectivism, they view everything as a plot. But on the other hand, I think it is fair to say the other side has some people just as guilty. They charge that opposition to their dreams of utopianism must always be translated as opposition to the humanitarian goal and for every charge of pink gold; or leftist, there is someone who can stand up and tell you right in the eye and say: "How dare you indict someone as a Communist or Fascist Group?" I think the time has come to

I think the time has come to recognize that the majority of Americans want and demand a solution to the problems I mentioned earlier that beset us. I don't think the American people will settle for anything less. The area for legitimate debate is how and at what risk to our traditional concepts of freedom and independence. There is no quarrel with the goals of the great society and there can be no denying that the great society will solve the problem but the question is, at what price. If it cannot, at the same time, remain a free society, it is not truly a great society. Now, I think we have already gone a long way in eroding many of our traditional safeguards. Lowell Mason, a former anti-trust law enforcer for the Federal Trade Commission, has written a book called "The Language of Deceit" and he says that in this country one sees a growing acceptance of the thesis "The Violation of the Economic Demands of the State" are more dangerous to our material welfare than criminal offenses and therefore can be punished without due process, and he says that today the hedge-hedge of laws and regulations concerning business practices are so confusing and so many and this is the man who enforced them, but he said that the Government literally ^{can find} confines some charge to bring against any business concern it chooses to prosecute. He was talking about this in a speech to a business man's convention one day and he made the point that you could absolutely find a business concern guilty either of anti-trust violation, or you could find it guilty the other way, of not cooperating and doing things the same as the other businesses. A man in the audience raised his hand and said "You fools found us guilty of both." Now, if you question this assertion, "What of the Farmer?" His property can be searched without a warrant if he is suspected of violating not a law but a regulation and a penalty, actually a fine, can be assessed without due process if he doesn't pay it, his property can be seized and in many instances has already been sold as auction. The case of Wickard vs. Filburn in the Supreme Court, a ruling was put down that clouds now the title to everything we

process. It was that the Government has the right to control what the government subsidizes. Today's Government subsidy virtually reaches into every phase of our lives. Another rule - Supreme Court - established that in the country today the Government has the right to tell a Citizen what he can plant on his own land for his own use but sometimes as Government spreads out it can get laughable if it isn't so painful. Right now there is a controversy going on in Washington, D.C. It seems that Harvey Dreyfus made a film for the Government that cost of quite some thousands of dollars. Now the film is a kind of an American Travelogue but it is an experiment in subliminal influence because running as a thread underneath this film is that tobacco is very delightful and is a great joy and pleasure, and they are going to display this film, hoping they can stimulate the consumption of American Tobacco but while they are arguing about that film in Washington, down in San Diego County the Government is conducting an experiment in which they are going to try to convince the people of San Diego County that smoking is bad for them and they should give up the use of tobacco. At the same time we find that the same Government that demands that tobacco now put something on their packages and in their advertising that says that tobacco is bad for you, the Government subsidizes the growing of tobacco and makes sure there is a market for all that the farmers can produce.

In the area of cotton, we subsidize, we have an artificially maintained price for the cotton grower but this is too high for the foreign consumer of cotton so we subsidize the sending of cotton abroad. Now the manufacturers abroad make cotton goods shirts and things out of this subsidized American cotton and they bring them in to the American market and they can undersell the American manufacturer. So the American manufacturer protested - you know what the answer is - the Government said "We'll subsidize you." So now they are being subsidized but all the while they have discovered there are a lot of

companies making synthetic fibers that compete with cotton and they said: "What about us?" You've guessed it, the Government is now exploring how they can subsidize the synthetic fibers and the only tragic thing that really hurts when you laugh is all these words suddenly, they all come out of one pocket, that's the fellow buying the shirt, that's the fellow who is going to buy the cotton goods and he is paying the whole freight for everybody to be fairly competitive with each other and it just somehow doesn't seem to make much sense.

The same Government says that two million farmers must leave the soil in the next few years, they are no longer needed, there is no place for the small family farm, only the large commercial farm, but that same Government insists that farms that are irrigated with Federal irrigation water must be no larger than 160 acres. Now, there is an alternative to the great society and it is not, as some people have ^{not} charged, just the unempathetic, "let them eat cake." I think the time has come for citizens to demand a third alternative to why they are not trying to solve the problem because, as I said, there is a great determination on the part of the people that the problem can and must be and will be solved.

I think, first of all, what is needed, and I believe it can begin at a local and a State level, is to cease costly many of our Government Programs, what are the goals? What are we trying to accomplish? And are we accomplishing these goals? Is the money well spent? Is welfare, for example, supposed to perpetuate poverty and create a permanent goal and we now have housing administrators point out that we are in a third generation that has been living on public's expense and, taking for granted that it is the way of life because they have never known anything in the family for three generations. Do we go on to a fourth, or should we do, and this should strike a chord with you because I believe you are interested and appalled in the kind of program use of public funds,

Shouldn't welfare be designed to end the problem? Shouldn't welfare, if it is successful, now make one thing plain, there are two phases or sections to welfare. I am not talking about those people who through no fault of their own, age, disability, whatever, cannot provide for themselves, and I am sure that everyone of us is proud of our ability to provide for those people not only the necessities of life but we hope that we can provide some of the comforts that make life worth living. I'm talking of that temporary section of welfare that is supposed to be in principal being tilted over an emergency period until they can get on their feet again and cut into society, as self-sustaining citizens. Now, in my opinion, this should be the function of welfare. Let men and women of goodwill who are in agreement on goals honestly get together to seek the practical solution. The Conservative has a responsibility to rule out of order those people in his own midst who are such purists that they would in truth settle for complete laissez-faire, degenerating, devil-takes-the-hindmost and say there is no answer if the individual can't provide for himself. Noone believes that with any common sense or responsibility. Of course I recognize, I'm sure there is a fringe that does but the Liberals at the same time must recognize and walk away first from those people in their midst who are using these problems as a device to achieve some kind of master plan for all mankind, or from those irresponsible people in their midst who refuse to legitimately debate a method and who automatically charge that anyone who won't accept their way of doing things is opposed to the humanitarian goal. Now, it's no Expenditure accusation, I believe, to point out that as this thing has grown there are some people who probably, without even realizing it, just automatically accept Government for Government's sake. I was amazed some time ago in New Jersey. We had a plan to allow the cities of Essex and Gloucester in this State to pool their resources and their rights and bring out a single virtually non-profit local government plan for Carter Hubbs and they would

this in New Jersey and they were defeated. The State would not allow them to do it, as our State did allow them to do it, and in announcing this refusal the Governor of New Jersey said "Why, you can't let them do that. That would make it more difficult for the Federal Government to get its compulsory program passed." Now here I suggest there is just Government for Government's sake - if it isn't going to be solved at the Government level then they are not going to let anyone solve it. The place of the Citizen in Government is more than just a march to the polls and pay a tax and do practical work in behalf of a cliche of professional politicians. The Founding Fathers were, as I said, ordinary citizens and they created a social and economic structure to be run by ordinary citizens and we honestly believe that there is some intellectual elite that is available to Government and capable of making all the decisions in our complex life and as to increase in numbers, isn't the reverse true in reality that we must turn not more to Government but less to Government because only the people actually do have the capability of solving the multitudinous problems, answering the questions, for example, that come up everyday in the market place, problems of living space, yes - the problems of human relationships.

How much fanfare greeted a commercial announcement not too long ago that ten Investor-owned Utility Companies had joined together in a commercial undertaking, investing two and a half billion dollars, and they were going to produce two hundred million dollars in new payroll, seventy-five million dollars in new taxes and a power output three times the total capacity of TWA and yet the average American knows nothing of this and no tax money changed hands. How well known is it that at the end of World War II Jesse Jones in the Government Administration is said to have proposed that it would be logical for Government Planning

in the transition from War to Peace, and so he formed a Council of Economic Advisors and he was spurred on by the plans that he already saw before the war was over on the Macroeconomic planning boards in Washington. He called in the Nation's business leaders and they voluntarily formed a program, 50,000 business men, through 2000 local committees, and they did the post-war planning. No tax money changed hands and today it is still in there and the Economists are trying to explain that no catastrophe happened, that we moved from the great War Economy, with no lessening of prosperity, right into a peacetime Economy. Several years ago there was a Federal employee who testified at a hearing as to whether the Government should ^{broaden} welcome a certain Welfare Program and when he had finished testifying in behalf of broadening it, that he solved nothing except that it must be broadened, one of the Congressmen asked him if he would suggest an alternative and speak on the other side and rather puzzled, he said "I don't know what you mean by the other side." There was only one side as far as he was concerned.

Well, I've chosen to describe ~~as~~ the Citizen's roll as that of an active participant in a creative society, with Government serving as an agent to mobilize the full creative energies of the people, to solve the problems which in the last analysis only the people can solve. I think the Government should ask the leaders of industry what can they suggest as a plan, how can Government cooperate, get out of their way if they are harassing or interfering, what can they do in the offering of tax incentives to stimulate industry so that here in our State, with its declining business climate the job opportunities will be available to the very kind of people that you deal with and that you are talking to. I think we have to get the professional people, I think we have to turn to the brains on the campus, I think we have to turn to people like yourself, for the answer to what is needed and what can Government be urged to cooperate in doing these programs and can be authorized at the local level where the

people doing the job have so much real knowledge of what is needed. A few years ago a National Magazine ran a series of articles on "What is our National Purpose" and many distinguished men contributed, spoke to this subject, or wrote to this subject, including the President of the United States, and curiously enough no profound truth emerged from any of these articles. Now, I don't mean to pose that having seen the monkey I could run the circus but it struck me since that perhaps the reason there was nothing profound out of their writings was because we had a National Purpose for some two hundred years, our National Service was the implementing of the original dream of the Founding Fathers, that man has the capacity for Self-Government, that by our success all men and Nations will be inspired to emulate this realization of man's age old dream to be an individual served by and not serving Government. The dream was asserted in the Declaration, it was reaffirmed in the Constitution, and to those people who would suggest that we have outgrown the Constitution and that it stands in our way to progress, I would suggest that it is probably the most vital and alive document contract, guaranteeing the most limited and equitable government that has ever been known in the history of man and to those who would depart from it, I could only quote Daniel Webster who said "Hold on, my friends, to your Constitution, to the Constitution of the United States of American and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster, what has happened once in six thousand years may never happen again. Hold on to your Constitution for if the American Constitution shall fail there will be Anarchy throughout the World.

Ronald Reagan

Now Mr. Reagan has graciously consented to accept the questions from the audience. If any of you have any questions you'd like to direct to him, he would be glad to answer them.

Mr. Ballinfield: Mr. Reagan - What, if anything, has happened in the last couple of years with regard to Special Program? What is your thinking about financing Adult Education?

Reagan: Well, first of all, when I spoke there and remarked about what you were doing you, of course, are in one of the most vital areas of today because, while in California we have some unemployment due to the lack of jobs, basically in this Country unemployment is due to a lack of job skills. For the three million unemployed in the United States there are three million jobs looking for workers. Now, it is very easy and I have found myself accused of being opposed to Federal Aid. No, I recognize the great necessity for Federal Aid because frankly I think the Federal Government down through the years has more and more usurped the tax raising ability of the local levels of the Government and of the States and it is our money and to do the necessary things that must be done we must have this money back. My objection has been to an excess of Government control that goes with Federal Aid and until we can see way, if it ever can be done, restore the ability to tax at the Local and State level for our own use, I favor Federal Aid that is money earmarked, without strings attached, and left at the Local and State level for us to make use of it as we see fit, so I have no quarrel with this financing of this program. Another one here? My goodness! Listen, let me tell you something. Don't think about me as a guest up here because there isn't going to be any real interest if you are going to be polite and not ask anything; you think might upset me - it won't, and I'm going to ask a lot of people in California what I'm going

to ask them and you've got a right to ask me whatever is on your mind.

I turned on the radio and read in the paper about you walking out of the meeting a week or so ago. I'd like to hear about that. I

~~My~~ ~~Meeting~~ Meeting in Santa Feites - I got mad! It was a Convention of the California Negro Republican Assembly and it has been, this is why I'm happy you asked, it has been quite inaccurately reported. No.1 - I did not walk out in the sense of disrupting a meeting that was going on. No.2 - I was not in any way displeased with the delegates or with the running of the Convention. It was well run, the questions were proper, we all answered them and the ground rules were that the questions could be directed to individuals, or to the group. There were three of us, three gubernatorial candidates there. Or, we could volunteer an answer to a question directed to someone else, and the last question of the day had been announced, which happened to be on Education. It was not, again as reported, on Legislation. The other two had spoken to the question and I then spoke to the question very frankly. After I had answered the question, I asked a point of personal privilege and I directed my words to my two fellow candidates because, very frankly, I thought that in their answers they had inferred throughout the afternoon that I belonged over in some kind of a corner with bigotry and racism and this touched a nerve. There is nothing I detest more in anyone than bigotry and I just wasn't going to stand still for even by inference, this being attached to me and I told them so and I told them I wasn't going to sit still for it there or any place else. I was mad and then I walked but later on I was over, we had a hospitality ending, most of the delegates to the Convention came over afterward and I'll tell you that there were some of them who said to me they would love to see it and going to take me that afternoon to do what I did. That is the whole story.

Question: On a lifelong educational basis, do you feel that you, together with the help of the Government, could solve this problem of Adult Education?

Reason: You would know more about this on a lifelong educational basis than I do but let me say that right now we have a great example of - let me suggest that perhaps there is an emergency basis right now for what you are going and for a long time to come. Whether this alters your long range goals -/down Pat -
Down here in South Central Los Angeles in the Watts Area there is a wonderful thing going on that was brought about by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. By that, with the tragic disturbance there, one man, Jack McLellan, did something that has been long overdue as far as the private sector of the economy is concerned. He mobilized the Chamber and he mobilized at that time more than a hundred industries, manufacturing industries here in Los Angeles, County and set down and his approach was "Look, we can't duck it any longer. This is our problem. You can't go on suggesting that Government find the jobs for people and put them on the people's payroll. This is like drinking your own blood to stave off starvation. The private sector of the economy must provide the productive jobs and the jobs of the future and you've got a hundred industries and now they are up to around 260 to pledge "Yes, they agree". They went down into this area and opened an office and a fine committee of responsible negro business men joined with them in helping them mobilize and find out the extent of the problem. There were about twenty-five thousand unemployed. Now they determined very quickly that about half of those were unemployable by reason of in some instances illiteracy and some disability, of course, things of this kind, but there were half of them that were employable if given some on-the-job training, or some immediately employable and to date, in six months, they have given more than 3000 jobs through this program in private industries and it is so successful that they are now talking of expanding this to a permanent thing for the entire metropolitan, our entire area here, but this comes to the answer to your question -

that other 50%. This is a social problem. This is the responsibility of all of us. There is no writing out of Government. There is a great legislative case for Government cooperation and here in the specialized and sometimes almost individual problems that you deal with all the time, this is where we are going to take that other half and minimize that down by eventually putting them in a position where they can be progressive and finally we are down to those people that are our responsibility because we are our brother's keeper. And so, I foresee you as having a very vital and positive role because many of these - why, I went down to visit Operation Bootstrap. There is a fine young fellow down there, Lou Saitz, but I don't know how long he is going to keep it going, he just hasn't been able to get the backing but by golly, they've got a well-worked out plan and idea but he told us stories that would tear your heart out. He told us stories of a 73 yr old woman who came in and said "I want to learn". He said "You can't send her away - you can't tell her that there is some red tape at which she is not eligible." He said "We'll find something -" "You can't tell her this and humiliate her by sending her away" and this is probably why I believe so strongly that such problems should be more administered with more autonomy at the local level because the farther away you remove things from the people the less respect there is for the individual. Just think if she went into some program where they had to say to her "Well, the rules specify that you are not eligible - you're beyond the" - and humiliated, she walked out. They'll find something for her - and she'll be very happy and improve herself. Is there someone else? I won't make a speech on all of these - Yes?

Question: As the owner of this State you will be the responsible member of the board of trustees of the University of California. I would like to hear your views on your ideas of trustees prior education in this State and the educational higher education and some of the financial

problems that are involved in trying to educate an increasing number of young people.

Roegen: Well, that is kind of a package deal, isn't it? First of all, with regard to some of the disorders that have taken place at Berkeley, I feel very strongly that the - I may lose some on this - I feel very strongly that the Faculty Committee should be restricted to academic problems and that the administering should be in the hands of the Administrators. They should be given a Code and a Pattern of what is expected and what is the Code of Conduct and the Rules and be told to administer within that code and if they won't, get someone that will. But now, as to the future - have you ever - I sometimes look at this and I wonder if we don't again, in research and study of these problems, need to ask ourselves again to clarify the goal and determine that we are not subsidizing, in some instances, intellectual curiosity instead of education at the public's expense. Now, I have no quarrel with intellectual curiosity but I wonder if the citizenry is totally responsible for finding some subsidizing on through various degrees. I'm thinking, to make it safe, you see, so I won't get in trouble, let me talk about Michigan State. I can't help but wonder if there isn't something wrong with Michigan State making it possible to get a Masters Degree in the repair of band instruments. Now, I don't think the taxpayer should have to subsidize or underwrite that, not to the extent of a Master's Degree anyway, and I wonder sometimes if we have it in our pride to have this fine Institution - I'll go this far and tell you that some of the Theatre Arts I have been in - now this happens to be my business, and I want to tell you that if some of these kids ever become big stars in television, movies, or on the stage, they will be a gain where their use in facilities equal to what they learned the art in at school. I'm doubtful by some of these and I think

that some of the biggest start on Broadway, in the dressing rooms with the pipes running through the ceiling and all this you know, and a steam radiator whistling away in the corner, and then you walk into all the facilities provided for the kids that are going to learn, revolving stages, and up-and-down stages, and radio stations, and TV Studios and all, I think maybe that it starts with/ "What is our goal" - and then let's find out if we're getting our dollars worth.

I won't stay for more than a minute or so as I promised Nancy I wouldn't and she is home waiting with the thermometer.

Question: I would like to ask you what the ^{significance} difference is of the Democratic Segment, the Negro Segment of the Democratic Party, and the Republican Party?

their own group in putting up candidates - now is this healthy - and now let me point out through the regular channels of the party, both of the parties .

Well this is - of course, you have touched a nerve with me. This was the question about minority groups within both political parties, forming their own groups, or associations, having conventions, nominating candidates, etc., or putting up candidates - I know that the leadership of both parties, when I say leadership I mean the elected Chairman, Central Committees, etc., I'm opposed to this and believe that the answer lies in full participation in the full party councils and I agree with that because I have a feeling that some years ago, for purely political purposes, an administration in this country hyphenated Americans and everybody was pulled over into a block, the Polish American, the Mexican American, the Negro American, and the Irish American, and they got everybody blocked off and then it became very handy and convenient to go to these separate groups with political promises but this is contrary to that some American dream I was talking about and frankly,

I favor un-hyphenating Americans. Of course, anyone of them, and whether it is due to our work, due to a minority status, a religious status, something that makes us go counter, such as a religion that objects to serving the Country in war, or something. We all have personal or individual problems, or group problems that require some special treatment but basically the problems that beset us are the same. There isn't any hyphenated group in this country that feels any differently about the inability or the worry of letting their wives walk down a City street at night, with the fear that the streets are no longer safe. There isn't anyone that isn't concerned about losing their home when they come to those non-earning years and find that they can't keep up with the escalating tax bill on the property because they are now on a retiring income such as Social Security. All of these problems are problems that must be solved by all of us together and our answer is togetherness. I have always subscribed in my life to a belief that there would be a lot less trouble in the world if we'd talk to each other instead of talking about each other. Incidentally, I will go back again to South Central Los Angeles and a wonderful thing that was started. I haven't been able to check on how it has been working out but some of the churches here in Los Angeles, negro and white churches, got together and evolved the plan of family to family and they have gotten people to go and visit in other people's homes and get acquainted and find out how many problems they have in common. I'm quite sure that probably those conversations, as they visited, dealt with recipes and what happens when Willie comes home, and you want to come up behind and whallop him with a stick, and should you or not. I know there must have been a great exchange and I know that they intend to continue this and I find this is far better than us continuing to separate ourselves.

Question: This is a balated question - When I sit in the teacher's room and I hear your name, then I hear types of laughter - and 'What - or why does he think he belongs in Politics?' And I'm rather irritated, because I haven't any answer. Why do you feel you are qualified for Governor? Is it - -

Reagan: No, it isn't. No - and I'm glad you asked it because I realize that I am sort of a subject to a two prong attack right now. I'm supposed to be some kind of a kook, a right wing kook who eats my young and on the other side I'm supposed to be totally without experience. Well, now you'll have to bear with me and let me just give a bit of these experiences. You see, I think experience comes in a lot of ways and I don't think necessarily that it has to come in a line - you all know the old story of the two people trying to get a job in the School System and the one had 25 years experience while the other one only had 1 year and they hired the one with 1 year. The other one protested and claimed this 25 years experience and the Superintendent said: "No - you had one year's experience repeated 25 times."

Now, my degree was in Economics and Sociology. I never went to Acting School but a lot of people found that out already. During the war I was an adjutant of an Air Base with 1300 Men and Officers and 250 Civilian Employees, and this means this is the Administrative Officer, but probably the greatest experience I have had along the lines of being an Executive or an Administrator happened to be with the Guild. Now, let me just explain to you - The Screen Actors Guild is a Working Union affiliated with the A F of L. The Screen Actors Guild has to do with the wages and the working conditions of more than 15,000 performers. We have an office in Hollywood, with an office budget of about \$300,000.00 per year, headquarters in New York, San Francisco, New Orleans, and Detroit, and we are a Working Union in that the elected officers do the work. We don't have any Jimmy Office doing it for us. When we negotiate, and I was in charge for twenty years, of the Contracts negotiating the contracts

with the Producers. We sit in a room, across the table, and shake our fists under their noses and pound the table with the men we work for and I say that we have probably one of the finest contracts that has ever been worked out for any Union, complete with a Pension and Welfare Fund, complete with all the protections that would go along with working conditions and all this. And if you think that everybody in Hollywood makes so much money they don't need a Union, let me point out to you that our average earnings for our people run just about the same as the Builder Trade Unions, because the overwhelming bulk of our people are free-lancers and if they wait at the phone for work they get a days work here and there, maybe two or three days in a part. That is the nature of their lives - it is a very complicated contact. In that connection, we had to - Murph - Senator Murphy and I were together for many years in this same experience. He, too, was a President of Guild before me; and we had to deal with Legislative bodies, with the Government, the things concerning wages and hour laws, and things that could have militated against our business, and this Industry Council that was mentioned is a very unique thing, or was a very unique thing in that it consisted of Representatives of 31 Unions and all the Ownership and Management Groups, and it dealt with those problems which effected the Industry as a whole, all our livelihood, and I was President of that twice and on the Board an additional eight years and at one time was sent by that Commission to Washington to appear before the Ways and Means Committee to advocate a Tax Policy that we thought would be beneficial to our industry. No one else was sent with me and no one, including the heads of the Studios, asked me what I was going to say. They just turned me loose to go and present what I thought was the proper case for the business. I'm on the Board of Directors of an Insurance Company, a Holding Company, a Hospital, was on the Board of Trustees at my College, and I feel that I have had experience that

qualifies me to do this. Now, I will make one last point. No State in the Union is so marked by the regime of one man as California is marked by the regime of Hiram Johnson, who had never served anday in office of any kind, in his entire life, was a Trial Lawyer until he became Governor of California and he freed this State from bossism and corruption. As I say - I am not a Politician - that is precisely why I am running. I just think it is high time that more ordinary citizens got in there who weren't bound in by the precedence that had been established and the obligations that go along with long years of participation. I might, even, just in closing, on that question, say that it is just a matter of experience. The fellow who is in there has had eight years experience and I happen to think that's what is wrong.

X Question: Is there any underlying scheme between Mayor Yorty and Mr. Christopher?

Why, when Mayor Yorty said those nice things, I just assumed that ^{meant} he was more afraid of me. ^{(I'm kidding,} No, I don't think there is any underlying agreement at all and I'm happy to see a contest on the other side for a change, although I was surprised to learn the things are going so well in Viet Nam that the Mayor feels he has time to do this - but - No, I'll tell you, in reality I think it is high time that the Democrats in this State (I was one most of my life) had a choice, an alternative to the encumbant, and I think that a primary between the two will bring out some things that need bringing out. The other day I made a statement that I will repeat here - For one thing - I hope such a thing will bring out an answer to the persistent rumors from Washington that the deal, if there is one, involves whether the Governor ~~will~~ is really going to serve four years, if he should be re-elected, or if he is not just advancing toward a pre-arranged launching pad leading toward a Washington address, because there is so much unusual activity around the

contest for Lieutenant Governor in the Democratic Party that you just can't help but believe that somebody knows something, something is cooking there. There was never such a scramble for that job as they are putting up, including the suggestion that Mr. Johnson's righthand man, Lloyd Hand, would come out and enter the race. But it is going to be interesting and I intend, as they cut each other up, to just help all I can.

* Question - (not heard) over transcriber.

Reagan: No, I certainly would not debate in the Republican Primary. I again have a deep-seated belief that a primary is a try-out in which no Republican should ever become engaged in a contest where he says anything that the other party can then use. He must operate on the basis that any one of us might be the Nominee and therefore you should always conduct the Primary so that everyone can unite with no bitterness behind whoever is the Nominee. As to debating Brown - I doubt if I would have that opportunity - I really couldn't tell you - I would have to wait and see what the situation was and what things look like then but I wouldn't debate another Republican. I think of a Primary as a Wednesday afternoon try-out, everybody is running down the track to see who can run the fastest and the fastest is going to run in the race on Saturday against the others school.

* Question: What are your views on California's War on Poverty? Do you feel that it isn't as successful as you had hoped? What would be your plans if you were elected - - - - -.

Reagan: Well, the War on Poverty, of course, is kind of out of the Governor's hands because you know this is one of the basic things that it wrong - the Poverty Program is so set up that it can virtually ~~overrule~~ ^{can virtually} ~~with the~~ ^{overrule} Governors or State Legislators and you know the Governors in ~~opinion~~ ^{opinion} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~stated~~ ^{stated} this and

demanding the right to have some say in their own States as to the implementing of these programs. Again - noone could quarrel with the goats but I think that this Poverty Program is turning out to be the biggest pork barrel and political patronage thing that we have ever seen. The one program that seems to be very successful is The Head Start Program. Maybe you know something that I don't know but certainly there is a real need there and something should be done but as for the rest of the program, they seem to be falling all over themselves and everything is getting organized and there is such fantastic - Now, in my little home town of Dixon, Illinois, a little committee of ten people set themselves up as an organization, self-appointed, and not responsible for the voters at all. They put in/a grant of \$33,000.00 to explore this home town and find out if there is any poverty there. Now, this \$33,000.00 will pay the Chairman of this little group \$12,500.00 per year, it will pay a couple of assistants \$7,500.00 a year and the rest is for office expenses. Why I know that town. You could take a couple days to walk up and down the streets and find out all you need to know about everybody in town because you know everybody's name in town. And there are countless programs that way. All I can say is about /~~that~~ the War on Poverty is that Poverty is winning.

Question: You mentioned that you had been a Democrat most of your life.

What brought about the change?

Reagan: What brought about my change from being a Democrat Well, Winston Churchill, you know, was a member of the Labor Party and changed to a Conservative, and he said it better than anyone could. He said "Some men change Principle for Party and some men change Party for Principle." I felt that the Leadership of the Democratic Party is no longer following the traditional precepts of the Democratic Party and I would give as proof of that

1932 Democratic Platform in which Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected. I suggested, when they were arguing about a platform in the last '64 campaign for the Republicans, "Why don't we take the 1932 Democratic Platform? It is brand new - it has never been used - and we're all in it - and our party, I would say, is in complete agreement with it. It's a platform that advocated "25% reduction in the cost of the Federal Government," it advocated "Return to the States and the Local Communities their Constitutional Rights that have been unjustly seized by the Federal Government." It sounds pretty Republican, doesn't it? But this was the part of the Democratic Party - it was a Party of Local Rules, State's Rights, Individual Freedom, and Constitutional Limits in the Power of Government. I don't know whether I left the party or the party left me. I was still around - Yes, I campaigned for Harry. It was after that that I began to - well, it was no sudden thing - I just sorta drifted - I was on the mashed potato circuit pretty consistently and speaking and I have always - -